



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/540,614	03/31/2000	David W. Grawrock	042390.P8084	2176
7590	10/06/2005		EXAMINER	ZIA, SYED
William W Schaal Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2131	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/540,614	GRAWROCK, DAVID W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Syed Zia	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____



DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 30, 2005 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to amendment filed on June 30, 2005. Original application contained Claims 1-23. Applicant previously amended Claim 14. Applicant currently amended Claim 1, 9, and 18. The amendments filed on June 30, 2005 have been entered and made of record. Therefore, presently Claims 1-23 are pending for consideration.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

Regarding Claims 1, 10, 16, 21, and 24 applicants argued that the system of cited prior art (CPA) [Ishac et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,861), Russell (U. S. Patent 4,841,492), and Brown (U. S. Patent 6,487,667)] “*operation of preventing modification of a representation of a primary pass-phrase*, and also does not teach “*an operation of disabling placement of an integrated circuit device into administrator mode when override disable pin is asserted prior to assertion of an override pin*”.

This is not found persuasive. In the system of cited prior art an indicator is connected to the main control unit to maintain the first component in power down state, even when power up signal is passed, and the components are maintained in power up state, when the power up signal is received by the main control unit. This power controller for computer has indicator that is coupled to main control unit to maintain first component in power down state even when power up signal is received. Therefore, pass-phrase authentication system authenticates user and service in accordance with identifier and pass-phrase of user and service respectively. An authentication entity selected according to the realm selected by user, authenticates the user and service in accordance with the identifier and pass-phrase of user and service respectively (Ishac: col.6 line 18 to col.9 line 20, Russell: Fig. 6B, Item 22, and Brown: col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5).

As a result, the system of cited prior art does implement and teaches a system and method for protecting information stored within an electronic system.

Applicants still have failed to identify specific claim limitations, which would define a patentable distinction over prior arts. The examiner is not trying to interpret the invention but is merely trying to interpret the claim language in its broadest and reasonable meaning. The

examiner will not interpret to read narrowly the claim language to read exactly from the specification, but will interpret the claim language in the broadest reasonable interpretation in view of the specification. Therefore, the examiner asserts that the system of cited prior arts does teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent Claim and in subsequent dependent Claims. Accordingly, rejections for claims 1-23 are respectfully maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishac et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,861), in view of Russell (U. S. Patent 4,841,492), and further in view of Brown (U. S. Patent 6,487,667).
3. Regarding Claim 1 Ishac teach a method (Fig.1-4) comprising:

implementing an integrated circuit device within an electronic system, the integrated circuit device including an override disable pin (col.6 line 18 to col.7 line 14); and preventing modification of a representation of a primary pass-phrase when the override disable pin is asserted, the primary pass-phrase permitting access to stored information within

non volatile memory of the integrated circuit device implemented within the electronic system (col.7 line 40 to col.9 line 20).

Although the system disclosed by Ishac shows the all features of the claimed limitation, but Ishac does not specifically disclose output disable pin.

In an analogous art, Russell, on the other hand discloses integrated circuit environment of an output disable pin (OD pin) connected to phase selector of a transmit focus block (Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Russell, because Russell's method of overriding (i.e. disabling) by specifically using a hardware pin installed in a integrated circuit would not only provide ability to disable the override by installing an integrated output disable pin in the system of Ishac during accessing information stored within electronic system but will also provide safeguards against attempt by unauthorized person to breach security of system by disabling the pin.

The system of Ishac and Russell teaches external powerdown signal recognized by powerdown controller but does not expressly disclose pass-phrase.

However, Brown teaches and discloses a pass-phrase authentication scheme that provides a way to authenticate users and services using a pass-phrase (col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Brown, because Brown's method of providing the pass-phrase input information from one or more user input devices, such as keyboard, a

mouse, or a microphone would not only provide ability to input pass-phrase in different mode and will also different representation of stored pass-phrase during identification and authentication.

4. Regarding Claim 9 Ishac teach a method (Fig.1-4) comprising:
enabling access to stored information within an electronic system, the information including a representation of a primary pass-phrase, upon assertion of an override disable pin of an integrated circuit device (col.6 line 18 to col.7 line 14); and
disabling access to the stored information despite assertion of the override pin of the integrated circuit device when an override disable pin of the integrated circuit device is asserted prior to assertion of the override pin (col.7 line 40 to col.9 line 20).

Although the system disclosed by Ishac shows the all features of the claimed limitation, but Ishac does not specifically disclose output disable pin.

In an analogous art, Russell, on the other hand discloses integrated circuit environment of an output disable pin (OD pin) connected to phase selector of a transmit focus block (Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Russell, because Russell's method of overriding (i.e. disabling) by specifically using a hardware pin installed in a integrated circuit would not only provide ability to disable the override by installing an integrated output disable pin in the system of Ishac during accessing information stored within electronic system but will also provide

safeguards against attempt by unauthorized person to breach security of system by disabling the pin.

The system of Ishac and Russell teaches external powerdown signal recognized by powerdown controller but does not expressly disclose pass-phrase. However, Brown teaches and discloses a pass-phrase authentication scheme that provides a way to authenticate users and services using a pass-phrase (col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Brown, because Brown's method of providing the pass-phrase input information from one or more user input devices, such as keyboard, a mouse, or a microphone would not only provide ability to input pass-phrase in different mode and will also provide different representation of stored pass-phrase during identification and authentication.

5. Regarding Claim 14 Ishac teach a method (Fig.1-4) comprising:
 - enabling placement of an integrated circuit device of an electronic system into an administrator mode upon assertion of an override pin of the integrated circuit device, data stored within the integrated circuit device can be cleared only when the integrated circuit device is placed in the administrator mode; (col.6 line 18 to col.7 line 14, and col.9 line 49 to line 65); and
 - disabling placement the of an integrated circuit device of the electronic system into the administrator mode despite assertion of the override pin of the integrated circuit device when an

override disable pin of the integrated circuit device is asserted prior to assertion of the override pin (col.7 line 40 to col.9 line 20).

Although the system disclosed by Ishac shows the all features of the claimed limitation, but Ishac does not specifically disclose output disable pin.

In an analogous art, Russell, on the other hand discloses integrated circuit environment of an output disable pin (OD pin) connected to phase selector of a transmit focus block (Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Russell, because Russell's method of overriding (i.e. disabling) by specifically using a hardware pin installed in a integrated circuit would not only provide ability to disable the override by installing an integrated output disable pin in the system of Ishac during accessing information stored within electronic system but will also provide safeguards against attempt by unauthorized person to breach security of system by disabling the pin.

The system of Ishac and Russell teaches external powerdown signal recognized by powerdown controller but does not expressly disclose pass-phrase.

However, Brown teaches and discloses a pass-phrase authentication scheme that provides a way to authenticate users and services using a pass-phrase (col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Brown, because Brown's method of providing the pass-phrase input information from one or more user input devices, such as keyboard, a mouse, or a

microphone would not only provide ability to input pass-phrase in different mode and will also different representation of stored pass-phrase during identification and authentication.

6. Regarding Claim 18 Ishac teach an electronic system (Fig.1-4) comprising:

a bus, a processor coupled to the bus, a system memory coupled to the bus, and an integrated circuit device coupled to the bus, the integrated circuit device including a memory (col.3 line 34 to line 64);

an override pin to enable access to and information of a representation of a primary pass-phrase upon assertion of the override pin, the primary pass-phrase permitting access to information stored within the memory (col.6 line 18 to col.7 line 14);

an override disable pin to disable access to and modification of a representation of the primary pass-phrase despite the assertion of the override pin when the override disable pin is asserted prior to assertion of the override pin (col.7 line 40 to col.9 line 20).

Although the system disclosed by Ishac shows the all features of the claimed limitation, but Ishac does not specifically disclose output disable pin.

In an analogous art, Russell, on the other hand discloses integrated circuit environment of an output disable pin (OD pin) connected to phase selector of a transmit focus block (Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Russell, because Russell's method of overriding (i.e. disabling) by specifically using a hardware pin installed in a integrated circuit would not only provide ability to disable the override by installing an integrated output disable pin in the system

of Ishac during accessing information stored within electronic system but will also provide safeguards against attempt by unauthorized person to breach security of system by disabling the pin.

The system of Ishac and Russell teaches external powerdown signal recognized by powerdown controller but does not expressly disclose pass-phrase.

However, Brown teaches and discloses a pass-phrase authentication scheme that provides a way to authenticate users and services using a pass-phrase (col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5).

Therefore, It would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Ishac and Brown, because Brown's method of providing the pass-phrase input information from one or more user input devices, such as keyboard, a mouse, or a microphone would not only provide ability to input pass-phrase in different mode and will also provide different representation of stored pass-phrase during identification and authentication.

7. Claims 2, 3, 5-8, 10, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claims 1, 9, 14, and 18. Furthermore, the system of Ishac, Russell, and Brown teach and describe a system and method for protecting confidential information stored within an electronic (Ishac: Fig.1-4), wherein

the integrated circuit device comprises a package to form a packaged integrated circuit device (Ishac: col.7 line 27 to line 54);

- preventing of the modification of the primary pass-phrase includes setting a control storage element within the integrated circuit device upon assertion of the override disable pin

(Ishac: col.11 line 10 to line 15; Brown: col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5, Russell: Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41); and

disabling modification of the primary pass-phrase when the control storage element is set (Ishac: col.10 line 44 to col.11 line 9, and Brown: col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5);

the integrated circuit device further includes an override pin which, when asserted, allows a stored representation of the primary pass-phrase to be modified (Ishac: col.11 line 23 to line 40, Brown: col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5, and Russell: Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41);

the setting of the control storage element includes setting a bit of at least one control register configured for permanent state retention over a plurality of power (Ishac: col.7 line 15 to line 25);

- the preventing of the modification of the primary pass-phrase includes signaling a control application software initiating a request for modification of the pass-phrase that a user is denied access to the stored information of the integrated circuit device unless the primary pass-phrase is correctly entered (Ishac: col.7 line 63 to col.8 line 62, and Brown: col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5);

a primary pass-phrase that includes a hash value of the primary pass-phrase (col.8 line 39 to line 62, and Brown: col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5);

control storage element includes at least one control register configured for permanent state retention over a plurality of power cycles (Ishac: col.10 line 53 to line 67);

the integrated circuit further comprises a package to contain the memory from which the override pin and the override disable pin protrude (Ishac: Fig.1-4, and Russell: Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41);

the memory of the integrated circuit device is non-volatile memory (Ishac: col.7 line 15 to line 25);

the integrated circuit device further includes a control storage (Ishac: col.4 line 39 to line 49);

the integrated circuit device 2 further includes a microcode to determine whether the override disable pin has been asserted prior to assertion of the override pin (Ishac: col.4 line 50 to col.6 line 7, and Russell: Fig. 6B, Item 22, col.10 line 10 to line 11col.11 line 40 to line 41).

8. Claims 4, 12, and 22 are rejected applied as above rejecting Claims 3, 11, and 21.

Furthermore, the system of Ishac, Russell, and Brown teaches and describes a system and method for protecting confidential information stored within an electronic, wherein

- the control storage element is set after placing the electronic system in an administration mode upon correctly inputting the primary pass-phase into the electronic system (Ishac: col.6 line 18 to col.7 line 14, and col.9 line 49 to line 65, and Brown: col.21 line 38 to line 41, and col.7 line 45 to col.8 line 5);

- the control storage element of the integrated circuit device includes at least one control register configured for permanent state retention over a plurality of power cycles (Ishac: col.10 line 53 to line 67).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Syed Zia whose telephone number is 571-272-3798. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sz



September 26, 2005